

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 KATHRYN MCKENZIE,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WALGREEN CO., *et al.*,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. 2:12-CV-44-KJD-NJK

ORDER

16 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Objection (#68) to Magistrate's Ruling (#66) on
17 Plaintiff's Emergency for Extension Of Discovery Deadlines (#44) and Plaintiff's Motion for
18 Sanctions (#47). Defendants filed a response in opposition (#88). Objections to the magistrate
19 judge's Order (#66) were filed pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-1 of the Local Rules of Practice of the
20 United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

21 Plaintiff is required to demonstrate that the magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous or
22 contrary to law. The Court finds that the magistrate's Order (#66) is neither clearly erroneous nor
23 contrary to law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a). See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). This
24 Court does not have a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made. See Weeks v.
25 Samsung Heavy Indus. Co. Ltd., 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir. 1997).

26 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Objection (#68) is **DENIED**;

1 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's Order (#66) is **AFFIRMED**.

2 DATED this 4th day of March 2013.

3
4 

5 _____
6 Kent J. Dawson
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26